

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 4, 2009, considered and rejected claims 1-21, 23-39, 41, 42 and 44-46. Claims 1-21, 23-39, 41, 42 and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hardy* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0044152 A1).¹

By this paper, claim 46 is amended, while no claims are added or cancelled. Accordingly, following entry of this paper, claims 1-21, 23-39, 41, 42 and 44-46 remain pending, of which claims 1, 20, 34, 37 and 46 are the independent claims at issue.

As reflected above, the claims are generally directed to methods and computer program products for allowing a variety of applications to initiate communication with a contact by utilizing a centralized store of contact information. As recited in independent claims 1 and 20, for example, a plurality of contacts are created with contact information that can be utilized by the various communication applications to initiate network communication with the plurality of contacts, and the contact information is stored in a centralized contact store accessible to the various applications. A contact interface is also provided which displays contact information in within one or more of multiple regions of a display window. The same display window is adapted such that it initially, simultaneously, and separately displays a contacts region, which includes contact information of one or more contacts, including at least address and phone number information when available. A tasks region is also displayed and includes one or more user-selectable links that launch one or more of the multiple communication applications that initiate network communication with the contact. The tasks region thus displays links, separate from contact information, and further includes a link for only each type of contact method available to the computing system in view of the applications installed and the amount of contact information available. Accordingly, for contact information that includes a voice phone number, email address and IM account information, and a computer which includes an email service, an IM service, and an electronic fax application, the links region can include a link to email and a link to send an instant message, while links for voice and fax communication are excluded inasmuch as insufficient contact information exists in the centralized database for a fax to be sent, and whereas no voice telephone application exists for voice telephony. A communication

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

application can then be launched in response to user selection of a corresponding link from the same window, but separate region, displaying the contact information, and the communication application may then receive access to a contact and its corresponding contact information through the contact interface or one or more other interfaces. The ability of the communication applications to then retrieve the contact information and utilize the information to initiate network communication with the contact is then enabled.

Independent claims 34 and 37 are directed to a method and computer program product, respectively, for implementing a similar method in which contact information is modified and updated on an application-specific database, and then accessed from the application-specific database. Independent claim 46 is directed to a method similar to claim 1, but which includes additional elements regarding the regions displayed on the contact interface, including the use of condensed and expanded contact information regions, in addition to the task region which allows launching of communication applications and editing of contact information.

While *Hardy* generally relates to a system in which contact information is shared between an address book and an instant messaging application, Applicant continues to respectfully submit that that it fails to disclose or reasonably support each and every element of the pending claims. Furthermore, inasmuch as the rejection by the Office is made under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicant notes that art is anticipatory only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (M.P.E.P. § 2131). Furthermore, general references to potentially similar features is insufficient for such a rejection as the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim, and the elements must not only be present, but must be arranged as required by the claim." (M.P.E.P. § 2131). Applicant traverses the rejection inasmuch as the cited art fails to disclose or reasonably support the claimed invention, and particularly fails to disclose each element in as much detail as the claim, or with the same organization as recited in the claims and as required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

By way of example, the cited reference fails to disclose an interface that includes: (a) a contacts region that includes address and telephone number information when available; and (b) a links region separate from the contacts region (i.e., separate from the region with the address and telephone number information) with links to communication methods for contacting the

contact. Indeed, the findings and interpretation of the Office, when considered in the context of the claim as a whole, and the arrangement of such, contrary thereto.

Specifically, the Office notes with respect to Figure 5 that there are separate contacts and links portions. In particular, the Office states that a top section includes the Address: John Smith and that it is separate from the links portion in the middle portion of Figure 5. (Office Action, p. 11). Notably, under such an interpretation, the top portion of Figure 5 includes only "Address: John Smith Time: 12:45." There is no telephone number information despite it being clearly available as it is presented in the middle portion. In other words, if the Office asserts that Figure 5 includes separate contact (top portion) and links (middle portion) regions, *Hardy* clearly teaches that it is the links portion that includes the telephone information. In contrast, the pending claims specifically recite that the contact portion has address and telephone number information while the links portion—which is separate from the contacts portion with the identifier and telephone number information—includes links to applications. Stated simply, while *Hardy* includes links to open applications, such links are directly included with the telephone information, and cannot therefore be separate from a contacts portion that includes the telephone number information.

With respect to claim 46, Applicant further notes that the Office has not even alleged that all of the claim elements are taught by *Hardy* and that the Office has thus clearly erred in its rejection. Specifically, claim 46 recites, among other things, that the display window includes a condensed contact information summary region (with identifier, address, telephone number and online status information) as well as an expanded contact information region (with additional address and additional telephone number information), and that both such regions are separate from the tasks region that includes the links. In the rejection of claim 46, however, the Office makes no mention of expanded or condensed regions, online status indicators, or additional address/telephone number information. Instead, it appears that the Office has merely considered claims 34, 37 and 46 as each claiming the subject matter. Such is clear error inasmuch as claim 46 recites additional information—as pointed out by Applicant in the immediately prior response. The Office has thus clearly erred as it has failed to consider each and every element of the pending claim 46.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will

be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 4th day of August, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Colby C. Nuttall, Reg. No. 58,146/
Colby C. Nuttall

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973